



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

efficiency until at the present time it is utterly inadequate; so that, even when the relief agencies of this country and of the relatively fortunate nations of Europe are in full operation, it will be difficult to move the supplies into the stricken areas. Allowing for the time necessary to move supplies from America, from which most of the relief probably will go; then allowing time to move it across Europe and into the famine districts, it is likely that winter will have overtaken many of the suffering people before material aid shall have been rendered. In that situation it is almost impossible to escape the conclusion that at the best many thousands, if not millions, of people will slowly die terrible deaths. Indeed, it is the judgment of some of those who have followed the Russian situation that sufficient relief cannot be mustered, transported, and distributed in time to save the adults who are threatened with starvation. Those who hold this view think that the best that can be done is to save the babies and children. Mr. Hoover seems to have had some such thought as this in his mind when he sent his statement to Gorky, for he spoke especially of the willingness of the Relief Administration to feed a million babies.

Into that dreadful prospect is injected the scourge of cholera and typhus. Late dispatches received in Washington quote the *Moscow Izvestia*, a presumably reliable Soviet organ, as stating in July that there were in the whole of Russia in the first six months of this year nearly forty-eight thousand cases of cholera, of which more than half appeared in June. It is believed by some familiar with conditions in Russia that these figures are conservative, since the lack of communication in the outlying districts may have made it impossible for the authorities to receive advices of all cases. And the indications seem to be that it will be extremely difficult to check the spread of the disease, owing to the lack of quarantine facilities and the mass migrations of peasants fleeing from their farms in search of food.

The bare statement of such facts as these dictates the duty of all the American people. It is immaterial whether the Soviet Government is good or bad; the fact that many thousands of human beings are at the point of wholesale death must cause every American to give whatever aid he can to those responsible relief agencies which are at work.

BROTHERS UNDER THE SKIN

SOME DAYS ago Senator France, of Maryland, who has been investigating conditions in Russia, appeared in Riga, accompanied by Mrs. Marguerite E. Harrison, of Baltimore, a newspaper correspondent who had been in prison in Russia for many months, charged

with being a spy. Senator France had procured the release of Mrs. Harrison by the Soviet authorities in advance of the release of other American prisoners held in Russia.

And now comes the surprising thing! Mrs. Harrison, out of Russia and free to tell her experiences, had no unkind word for the individual Russian. So far as the dispatches which have come from Riga and Berlin show, Mrs. Harrison's accounts of the attitude toward her of the Russians with whom she came into contact indicate that they were kindly men. She tells of their politeness and great courtesy during the most rigid examinations made of her. The Russian inquisitors even offered her tea in friendly, social way. And during her imprisonment they seem to have granted her as much consideration and comfort as could have been expected under all the circumstances prevailing in that land—more, in fact, than her friends in America thought likely.

All of this need not affect one's previous judgment, one way or the other, as to the methods by which the Soviets acquired control of Russia, or the methods by which they have maintained that control, or the effects of that control upon the many millions of Russian people. But this case of Mrs. Harrison does serve to remind us that, however far from accepted standards a great nation may wander and whatever one may think of the results of that wandering, it is still true that the ordinary human virtues may be found among most of the people; and that in turn serves to remind us that the Russian people still possess qualities that will make them worthy neighbors of other civilized peoples and worthy citizens of the world when the days of their political and governmental unhappiness shall have passed.

Undoubtedly the story of Mrs. Harrison, so far as we have it, will soften the attitude of the American people toward the Russian masses and will revitalize the human tie between them. And it should create a deeper sympathy for the many millions of people in Russia—men, women, and children—who are today on the verge of starvation and probably facing the most terrible winter in the annals of recorded history.

THE GREAT STAGE A SHOW

ORDINARY MEN have had cause for great comfort lately. Lord Northcliffe, who has been criticizing Mr. Lloyd-George and Lord Curzon, spent a few days with us in the course of a trip around the world. Sir Auckland Geddes, the British Ambassador, desiring to be pleasant to his distinguished countryman, arranged a dinner for him. And then the fun began; also some illumination of the inner mental workings of the great,

which served to give the ordinary man the comfort above mentioned.

Out of a clear sky it became known that Sir Auckland had recalled the invitations for the dinner to Lord Northcliffe. A few hours and the noble Lord, half humorously and half petulantly, gave out a statement telling the world that the noble Lord Curzon was at fault. Were we not discussing the great, we would paraphrase Lord Northcliffe's statement by saying, in the homely phrase of the South, that Lord Curzon was the "nigger in the wood pile." Also Lord Northcliffe, in his statement, cast some light upon the social characteristics of Lord Curzon, as revealed in his habits as Viceroy of India. We gathered that Lord Northcliffe regarded Lord Curzon as a bit snobbish.

Further complications, even more amusing to the ordinary man, ensued. Mr. Lloyd-George, in Commons, denounced Lord Northcliffe for an interview in the *New York Times*, in which King George was stated to have asked Mr. Lloyd-George, with reference to Ireland, something about how much longer he was going to kill "my people." Mr. Lloyd-George set forth a denial from the King that any such thing had been said.

More complications. It developed that the *New York Times'* interview was not with Lord Northcliffe, but with Mr. Wickham Steed, editor of the *Times*, one of Lord Northcliffe's papers, who is traveling with his chief. Soon followed word from Mr. Steed to the effect that he had been misquoted—familiar words to newspaper reporters in such and similar situations. Later we gathered that Mr. Steed had not been misquoted, but that he had been quoted when he had not intended to be quoted. Meantime the *Daily Mail*, another of the Northcliffe papers, had received over the cables the Steed interview and had run it in its Irish edition as an interview from Lord Northcliffe.

Add to all of those ingredients a cablegram from Lord Northcliffe to King George denying that he had given such an interview, and also add numerous direct and indirect expressions of opinion about one or another phase of the affair, from the recalling of the invitations to the dinner by Sir Auckland to the excitement in London, and the result is a performance calculated to contribute mightily to the gayety of all those possessed of an undisciplined sense of humor.

But while we are chuckling it would be well to remember that often there is something to be learned from the funny things of life. The moral in this case, if we may preach a little, is that the remarkable men involved—and they are remarkable and able men—are still very human. They are clay, like the balance of us. And that means that it is a good thing for the masses of the people of the world to think for themselves about

matters that too often in the past have been regarded as the sole province of the Lloyd-Georges, the Northcliffes, and the Curzons of all countries.

THE *Nation*, which has been offering repeated warnings in the last few weeks of danger of aggressions by this country against Mexico and other nations to the south of us, makes the charge editorially, in its issue of July 27, that "the great business forces," which it says "hold the leading strings of our national destiny," are dictating in a conscious, militant way a policy of "Mittel-Amerika" with respect to the relations between this country and the Latin-American nations rich in natural resources.

This implies a charge that the American governmental policy toward the nations of Central and South America is at one with the schemes of various mercenary interests that undoubtedly have attempted to exploit those countries ruthlessly, and it implies that efforts made to influence American policy have been effective. The American people are hardly ready to accept such charges at face value, but they will observe carefully the developing evidence to be presented by the *Nation*. Certainly, such charges, if they can be upheld successfully, will arouse profound resentment among the masses who believe the United States Government to have given a fine brotherly helpfulness to its neighbors.

THE TWENTY-FIRST universal peace congress was held in Luxembourg, August 10 to 13, 1921. The meeting was called upon the initiative of the executive committee of the International Peace Bureau, meeting at Berne June 10. The program consisted of the following:

1. The creation of a police force for the earth, sea, and air.
2. Equitable distribution of raw materials and the suppression of customs abuses.
3. Amendments to the covenant of the League of Nations; representation of the peoples in the Assembly of the League; mode of voting in the Assembly; the place of law in time of war; international code of justice; obligatory jurisdiction.
4. Current events.
5. Report.
6. Propaganda.

The call was signed by the President of the International Peace Bureau, Senator H. La Fontaine, of Belgium, and by the Secretary, Dr. H. Golay. Accompanying the call was a message to the peace societies by the President. This message appears elsewhere in these columns.

THE *London Times*, telling of the American girl in Max O'Rell's story who, on being shown in an English museum an American cannon taken at Bunker Hill, remarked, "Guess we've got the hill, anyhow," goes on

to say that the British also have got the hill. And thereby hangs a pleasant tale. The English have a Bunker Hill near Hampstead Heath, and they propose to have people on both sides of the Atlantic contribute for the erection there of a monument "to commemorate the fact that during the World War Americans and Englishmen fought side by side in the cause of right and liberty." Whereas the Bunker Hill monument near Boston tells a story of strife between Americans and English, the English would have the new Bunker Hill monument tell of unity. It is estimated that the site and the memorial will cost from \$50,000 to \$75,000. Among those supporting the project are said to be Lord Bryce, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, Lord Burnham, Lady Astor, Lord Crewe, Lord Lytton, Lord Leverhulme, and the Bishop of London. Mrs. S. A. Barnett is chairman of the committee.

SO OFTEN in these latter days is Lloyd-George, once the hope of the liberal-minded not only of England, but of the continent, painted as one lost to the dreams of his youth and become an imperialistic and time-serving politician, that there is real pleasure in reading these paragraphs from his speech, delivered at the unveiling of the war memorial at Thames on July 30:

Our sole anxiety is lest the Allies, by the unwise, harsh use of their undoubted power, should ram deeper and firmer into the soil those roots of future conflict which were withering on the surface in the sunshine of the great victory.

The British Premier went on to say that another war would be horrible beyond thought. He told of the evolution, during the war, of machines of destruction terrible, and yet more terrible, and said the ingenious mind of man will go on developing these horrors, if the war purpose is allowed to lodge and grow in the minds of men. He pictured the whole of Europe, possibly, as reduced to the state of utter devastation that overtook the north of France, should another great war come, and he continued:

We must beware lest we bequeath to our children a legacy of concentrated hate which will one day explode, shattering their happiness and leaving the world a wilderness, and man a gaunt wanderer among the ruins of a civilization his folly has destroyed.

OF COURSE, the religious sanctions are of importance to the promotion of peace in the world. A true human society depends greatly upon the religious thought and temper of men. The Fellowship of Reconciliation, recognizing this fact, is planning its eighth general conference, to be held at the New Columbia Hotel, Belmar, New Jersey, September 8 to September 11. This group of religious-minded persons is con-

cerned to consider seriously the fundamental principles underlying our great social efforts. They aim to avoid loose thinking on the one hand and sentimentality on the other, and to test out anew the validity of the principle of redemptive love intelligently and consistently. Their program, divided into four parts, is accompanied by thought-provoking questions intended as an aid to the success of the conference. The questions follow:

The Basis of a True Human Society

What is the true social goal?

Which should come first, a conception of the Kingdom, or a criticism of the present social order?

How can the test of Jesus' principles be applied to the structure of the social order as well as to its method of functioning?

What is the best point of approach in building the Kingdom: international relations, the industrial order, the individual?

What factors today are making for the substitution of "love" for competition?

Is enlightened self-interest compatible with Jesus' ideal?

Is there a place for denunciation of evil in the program of love?

Is there a place for any army or navy in Christian society?

Can the Fellowship formulate more definitely than it has yet done its attitude toward the whole social order?

The Overcoming of Evil by Love

Is the final victory of good a necessary postulate of faith?

What risks are there in resting our whole case on love in the present development of the world?

Is love a universal method or only an occasional one for special circumstances?

Within what limits is the use of force consistent with the program of love?

If the treatment of criminals and the insane is delegated to the State, how can Jesus' principles be applied in such fields? To what extent does public opinion affect the State?

How can love be organized in a corporate expression to meet the organized forces of evil?

The Problem of Compromise with the Present World

Can the individual dissociate himself entirely from the evil which inheres in our present international, industrial, and social relations? Should he?

What principles should guide a person in drawing the line?

To what extent, if any, should a person participate in organizations which he believes to be on a wrong basis for the sake of influencing a change in them?

a. In international affairs: Should he take official part in a government founded on force?

Should he support such a government by taxes or service?

b. In industry: Should he hold stock in a corporation not functioning in accordance with Jesus' principles?

Should he join a union that believes in coercive methods?

c. In religion: Should he work with churches or other organizations that are apparently committed to the present social order?

Substitute Methods in Place of War

If a person refuses because of principle to take part in war, is he accepting security at the price of some one else's sacrifice?

How can public opinion be released for a more flexible response in emergencies?

Would a world court need the backing of military and naval power to function effectively?

Is a general strike to prevent war a Christian use of force?

Does the Non-Co-operation movement in India represent an expression in harmony with Jesus' principles?

Is international reconciliation on the basis of the present order a hopeful method of procedure? Why, or why not?

THE FOLLOWING little parable, "A Note From Noodleland," is from the pen of the former Assistant Secretary of Labor, Louis F. Post. We ran across it in *The Christian Century*. It runs:

Once in Noodleland the upward-looking natives resolved to have a temple built, towering toward the sky.

So they sent for an architect, who made them a thrilling picture of the kind of temple they thought they wanted. It pleased them to the tingle of a finger-tip, and they hired him to put the job through.

After a few days, seeing no signs above the hilltop of the temple for which their souls craved, they went in a body to the chosen site across the hill to see how the work might be going on. There they found their architect hard at work directing the digging of a great hole in the ground.

"What are you doing?" their spokesman asked.

"Building your splendid temple," the architect replied.

"But you are building it in the wrong direction," the spokesman explained. "Our temple was to tower toward the sky."

"It is for a firm foundation that I am digging down," said the architect.

"Foundation nothing!" the crowd shouted in chorus. "We didn't order a foundation. We ordered a temple."

Then they denounced the treacherous architect to his face and mobbed him.

THE EVENTS of this month in international affairs should convince the most skeptical that the peace forces of the world are rapidly regaining their feet. In Luxembourg the International Conference of Peace Societies has been in session, on August 10, 11, and 12. It is the first gathering of representatives of these societies since the outbreak of war. A week later the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union began in Stockholm, running from August 16 to August 19. Again, this is the first gathering since the outbreak of the war. And while these consistent workers in the cause of peace and understanding foregather, as in the pre-war days, the great forces, arising from the people everywhere and demanding peaceful organization of the world, bring about the disarmament conference.

TO THE PEACE SOCIETIES

By SENATOR HENRI LA FONTAINE, of Belgium, President of the International Peace Bureau

(A Translation)

IN RESPONSE to the demand expressed by a large number of those who wish, as we do, that the world may orient itself again and turn toward an era free of violence, we have decided to call once more a universal peace congress. We are told that solemn and far-reaching declarations are expected from those who advanced without ceasing, even before the war, the solutions which diplomats have consented to envisage and to realize partially and imperfectly.

It is certain that the disillusioned people are taking refuge behind their new frontiers in attitudes of defiance and fear. Above all, criminal voices raise themselves, calling to arms and inciting governments to accumulate instruments of murder for battles which they assure them are at hand. It is with a woeful resignation that men proclaim war to be a perpetual institution, and some do not hesitate to accept the blasphemy that it is a divine institution. And so the increase of armaments has begun, more crushing and more enervating than ever.

In the hour when all humanity is crushed by the disastrous consequences of the greatest of wars, certain politicians, who at this moment lead the peoples on toward massacre, have repeated, to the point of satiety, that this ought to be the last war, the war to end war. In the hour when the productivity of fields and factories ought to be increased to the maximum, they keep in the camps and in the barracks millions of workers, swallowing up billions in profitless expense, leading to figures which will amount to millions of billions, all for the purpose of creating corpses and ruins.

From many conversations it is recognized and affirmed that the outstanding need is to stop men in this foolishness. But only a few have the civic courage to prepare themselves to speak the truth and to say to the suffering crowds that they are hastening toward the most shocking of suicides. Only a few have an international equal to their national civic courage.

It is the duty of those who consider themselves citizens of the world, members of the society of nations, to spread the liberal spirit, to express unequivocally their conviction in a possible future where constraint will be the servant of right. This cry ought to be loud enough to be heard to the uttermost parts of the earth, and, above all, to penetrate the ears of the impenitent deaf, and the ears of those worse than deaf, who do not wish to hear, because the renown for which they are eager is made possible, wholly or in part, by conflicts which serve as spring-boards or pedestals for them, or because of the fructifying stipends coming to them copiously from the manufacture of war implements more and more enormous by technicians, incited by the colossal profits which come to them because of their infernal inventions. This cry ought to end in a tumult of other cries surging from the masses of the people—cries that would overcome the rumors of the subsidized pamphleteers in an international oligarchy athirst for glory and gold.